

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 15 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended herein to include a U-bolt received through first and second sets of apertures.

Claim 4 has been amended herein to include third and fourth sets of apertures, through which a second U-bolt is received. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 has been amended herein to recite a U-bolt as opposed to "fastener". Antecedent basis for the U-bolt is provided in amended claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 8 has been amended herein to recite a second U-bolt. Claims 9 and 10 have been amended herein for dependency on claim 8, which provides antecedent basis for the second U-bolt. Claims 9 and 10 have been further amended to delete "the second engagement face". Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvert (U.S. Pat. No. 5,354,092) in view of Hamlet (U.S. Pat. No. 3,194,580). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject-matter contained therein. Applicant further notes that claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein to include a U-bolt that encompasses the leaf spring. Applicant respectfully notes that neither Calvert nor Hamlet teach each and every limitation of the claims, as amended. More specifically, both Calvert and Hamlet teach U-bolts having ends that encompass the axle and lie adjacent to the leaf spring. The present invention, however, includes a U-bolt having ends between which, the leaf spring is disposed. The U-bolt of the present invention does not wrap around the axle itself, as taught in Calvert and Hamlet.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully notes that Calvert in view of Hamlet fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 2 – 4, 6 and 8 – 10, Applicant respectfully notes that each is depends from either claim 1 or 7. Claims 1 and 7 define over the prior art as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 2 – 4, 6 and 8 – 10 also define over the prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 20, 2003

By: 

Joseph M. Lafata
Reg. No. 37,166

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/RPM

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 21 2003

GROUP 3700

OFFICIAL